OIPE
IAP47
NOV 02 2006
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

In the claims

Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been amended to define the present invention more clearly, and a new claim 20 is added.

The amended claim 1 is supported by lines 13-21 in page 11 of the specification and the amendment of claim 4 is supported by lines 11-22 in page 13 of the specification. The new claim 20 finds support at lines 17-23 in page 10 of the specification and by Fig. 3.

These amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure of this application and therefore do not constitute the introduction of any new matter into this case and therefore meet the written description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Rejection of claims 1-4 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4 and 19 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by either Genovese (U.S. 5,240,484) or Japanese Patent No. 5091962 (JP 5091962). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The present invention, as set forth in the amended independent claim 1, is directed to a vacuum cleaner including an electric blower for generating suction air, a collecting unit for collecting dust contained in the suction air, a dust removing unit for removing dust adhered to the collecting unit; a dust removing stop unit for stopping an operation of the dust removing unit, and a power off switch for cutting off a power to the electric blower.

The dust removing stop unit, which is different from the power off switch, saves power consumption of the dust removing unit and enhances convenience by halting the dust removing operation in response to the user's selection or the operational circumstances of the vacuum cleaner (see lines 22-26, page 3 and line 1, page 4 of the present application).

It is respectfully submitted that the present invention, as set forth in claim 1, is not anticipated by either Genovese or JP 5091962, since neither reference discloses or suggests each and every element set forth by claim 1.

Neither Genovese nor JP 5091962 discloses or suggests a dust removing stop unit distinct from a power off switch.

While Genovese describes a tube 47 which removes dust adhered to a vacuum cleaner bag by beating or vibrating the interior sidewalls of the bag (see *Genovese*; col. 8, lines 32-35), the tube stops operating when the cleaning operation is finished. The tube flaps or oscillates, to beat against sidewalls of the dirt collecting bag 13, only when the vacuum-generating means (motor-fan unit 21) is operated, since the flapping or oscillation is a result of turbulent airflow in or around the tube 47 (see *Genovese*; col. 8, lines 1-35).

Accordingly, Genovese cannot disclose or suggest a dust removing stop unit for stopping the operation of the dust removing unit, and a power switch for cutting off power to an electric blower.

Similarly, while JP 5091962 describes a dust removing unit for removing dust adhered to a dust collecting unit, JP 5091962 offers no teaching or suggestion of a dust removing stop unit and a power switch for cutting off power to an electric blower. In fact, JP 5091962 appears to be totally silent with respect to any manner of dust removing stop unit set forth in claim 1, and with respect to when and how the dust removing operation of the dust removing unit is stopped.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by either Genovese or JP 5091962, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over these references.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4 and 19 are allowable over Genovese and JP 5091962 at least due to their dependency from claim 1. Moreover, claims 2-4 and 19 each set forth additional limitations not found in either Genovese or JP 5091962.

According to claim 2, the dust removing stop unit is a stop switch operated by a user and disposed separately from a power off switch. No such disclosure is found in either Genovese or JP 5091962.

In fact, Genovese clearly describes a dust removing unit (the tube 47) that is only operable as a result of the operation of the vacuum motor. The tube 47 is not electrically operated in any way, apart from its association with the turbulent airflow caused by operation of the vacuum motor. Therefore, the tube 47 could only be stopped in accordance with a means for cutting off power to the vacuum motor, and not by a separate stop switch. Further, it must be noted that Genovese does not even disclose a power switch for operating the vacuum motor.

According to claim 3, a mode conversion switch is provided for operating the electric blower at one of various power modes, by applying a different input power to the electric blower for a different power mode, wherein the operation of the dust removing unit is halted when the mode conversion switch is activated.

Since Genovese does not even disclose a power switch for operating the vacuum motor, it cannot possibly be construed to provide any teaching or suggestion of a mode conversion switch is provided for operating the electric blower at one of various power modes. JP 5091962 also lacks any teaching or suggestion of such a mode conversion switch. It follows that, without any teaching or suggestion of a mode conversion switch, there can be no teaching or suggestion of halting the dust removing unit upon activation of the mode conversion switch.

Claim 4 provides that the operation of the dust removing unit is stopped when the power off switch is operated by the user to switch the electric blower to one of the power modes. Neither Genovese nor JP 5091962 discloses or suggests that a dust removing unit is stopped when the electric blower is operated. In fact, the tube 47 of Genovese cannot be operated unless the vacuum motor is turned on.

Claim 19 provides that an indication unit includes a vibration generation unit generating a vibration synchronized with a vibrational operation of a vibrator serving as the dust removing unit. Further, claim 19 states that the indication unit is disposed at a grip portion of the vacuum cleaner. Neither Genovese nor JP 5091962 discloses or suggests any indication unit, and more particularly neither Genovese nor JP 5091962 discloses or suggests an indication unit that includes a vibration generation unit, or an indication unit that is disposed at a grip portion of the vacuum cleaner.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 19 are each allowable over the cited references, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 5-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-16 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over either Genovese or JP 5091962 in view of Valbona et al (U.S. 3,667,084), and claims 17 and 18 are rejected as being unpatentable over either Genovese or JP 5091962 and Valbona and further in view of Tai (U.S. 6,228,155). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5-10 depend from claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Valbona fails to supplement the deficiencies discussed above with respect to the teachings of Genovese and JP 5091962. In particular, Valbona does not disclose or suggest any sort of a dust removing unit as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, Valbona cannot supplement the deficiencies of Genovese and JP 5091962 with respect to the dust removing stop unit.

Turning to the elements set forth in claim 5, none of the cited references disclose or suggest an input detection unit for detecting an input power to the electric blower, wherein the operation of the dust removing unit is halted when the input detection unit detects a change in the input power to the electric blower.

None of Genovese, JP 5091962, and Valbona disclose or suggest an input detection unit for detecting an input power to the electric blower. Valbona discloses only a thermostat 70 which is responsive to the temperature of the motor. Even if the thermostat is construed to detect an input power to the electric blower, there is no teaching or suggestion that the operation of a dust removing unit (or any other part of the vacuum cleaner) is halted according to the detection.

On the contrary, the thermostat only functions to illuminate a warning light. According to Valbona, "a thermostat 70, in heat exchange contact with the stator core 67 of the motor, is responsive to the temperature of the motor and closes to warn of a high temperature by ***energizing the red warning light 68 to indicate that the bag should be emptied*** because not enough air is getting through the filter bag to adequately cool the motor. Thus, the warning light 68 indicates when the motor becomes too warm and also that the filter bag requires emptying for efficient vacuuming operation." (*Valbona*; col. 3, lines 13-21).

Therefore, Valbona cannot be construed to provide any teaching or suggestion of a detecting unit wherein a halting operation of any aspect of a vacuum cleaner occurs upon detection of a change in input power to the electric blower.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5, and therefore are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5. Further, claim 5 recites that operation of the dust removing unit is halted when the input detection unit detects an increase in the input power to the electric blower, and claim 7 recites that the operation of the dust removing unit is halted when tie electric blower power is turned on.

Each of these conditions is ***counter*** to the function of Genovese, since the tube 47 of Genovese depends on the operation of the vacuum motor for its operation. Accordingly, such a modification of Genovese would necessarily require alteration of the operating principle of Genovese.

Claims 8-10 each recite additional, specific, detecting units such as a hood detection unit for detecting whether a hood is open (claim 8), a collecting detection unit for determining whether the collecting unit is installed or not (claim 9), and a hose detection unit for finding whether a hose is connected or not (claim 10).

None of Genovese, JP 5091962, and Valbona teaches or suggests the hood detection unit, the collecting detection unit, and the hose detection unit. The thermostat of

Valbona simply cannot be construed as each of these different detectors as recited in the claims 8-10.

Independent claim 11 is directed to a vacuum cleaner including an electric blower for generating suction air, a collecting unit for collecting dust contained in the suction air, a dust removing unit for removing dust adhered to the collecting unit; and indication unit for informing a user on an operation state of the dust removing unit.

None of Genovese, JP 5091962, and Valbona teaches or suggests an indication unit for informing a user on an operation state of the dust removing unit.

Only Valbona discloses any manner of an indicating unit. However, Valbona only discloses that "a thermostat 70 [...] is responsive to the temperature of the motor and closes to warn of a high temperature by energizing the red warning light 68 to indicate that the dust collecting bag should be emptied." (*Valbona*; col. 3, lines 13-17). The thermostat 70 and warning light 68 of Valbona indicate when the dust collecting bag should be emptied and do not inform the user the operation state of the dust removing unit, or of any other operational state of the vacuum cleaner.

Therefore, the combination of Genovese, JP 5091962, and Valbona fails to form a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 11, since the references even in combination fail to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 11. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11, is allowable over the cited references.

Further, it is submitted that claims 12-19 are allowable over the cited references at least due to their dependency from claim 11.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected as being unpatentable over either Genovese or JP 5091962 and Valbona, in further view of Tai. It is respectfully submitted that Tai fails to supplement the deficiencies of Genovese, JP 5091962, and Valbona discussed above, and therefore claims 17 and 18 are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

Further, none of the cited references disclose or suggest that an indication unit (for informing a user on an operation state of the dust removing unit) includes a sound generating unit (claim 17) or that the sound generating unit generates a sound while the dust removing unit is turned on, and stops generating the sound when the dust generating unit is turned off.

At best, Tai discloses a detecting unit 30 has a circuit unit 50 to generate a warning voice when an amount of dust collected in a sampling filtering net 20 is been over a standard value. However, the detecting unit and its warning voice are not associated with any operating state of the apparatus disclosed by Tai. Accordingly, Tai cannot provide any teaching or suggestion of the claimed sound generating unit which provides an indication of the operating state of the dust removing unit.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of claims 5-18 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Double patenting

The examiner asserts that "claims 1-4 and 19 of this application conflict with claims 1 and 15 of application no. 10/721,878. However, Applicant notes that claims 1 and 15 of the application No. 10/721,878 do not claim a dust removing stop unit for stopping the operation of the dust removing unit distinct from a power off switch. Therefore, claims 1-4 and 19 of this application do not conflict with claims 1 and 15 of the U.S. application No. 10/721,878.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-20 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: November 2, 2006